arXiv:1702.06698v1 [cs.FL] 22 Feb 2017

Computing the longest common prefix of a context-free language in polynomial time

Michael Luttenberger, Raphaela Palenta, and Helmut Seidl

TU München, Germany, {luttenbe,palenta,seidl}@in.tum.de

February 23, 2017

We present two structural results concerning longest common prefixes of non-empty languages. First, we show that the longest common prefix of the language generated by a context-free grammar of size N equals the longest common prefix of the same grammar where the heights of the derivation trees are bounded by $4N$. Second, we show that each non-empty language L has a representative subset of at most three elements which behaves like L w.r.t. the longest common prefix as well as w.r.t. longest common prefixes of L after unions or concatenations with arbitrary other languages. From that, we conclude that the longest common prefix, and thus the longest common suffix, of a context-free language can be computed in polynomial time.

1 Introduction

Let Σ denote an alphabet. On the set Σ^* of all words over Σ, the prefix relation provides us with a partial ordering $\sqsubseteq$ defined by $u \sqsubseteq v$ iff $uu' = v$ for some $u' \in \Sigma^*$. The *longest common prefix* (lcp for short) of a non-empty set $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ then is given by the greatest lower bound $\bigsqcap L$ of L w.r.t. this ordering. For two words $u, v \in \Sigma^*$, we also denote this greatest lower bound as $u \sqcap v$. Our goal is to compute the lcp when the language L is context-free, i.e., generated by a context-free grammar (CFG).[1]

The computation of the lcp arises naturally in various applications of context-free languages. As a first example, recall that the possible (unevaluated) runs of a recursive program can be described by a context-free grammar: the nonterminals of the grammar are then in one-to-one correspondence to the nodes of the interprocedural control-flow

[1] It is folklore how to efficiently compute from a given CFG for L an CFG for its reversal $L^R = \{a_l a_{l-1} \dots a_2 a_1 \mid a_1 a_2 \dots a_{l-1} a_l \in L\}$; hence, computing the longest common suffix of a context-free language is trivally reducible in polynomial time to the computation of the lcp of a context-free language.

graph, and the lcp of the language generated by any nonterminal is the longest common sequence of statements *always executed* whenever the respective node in the control-flow graph is reached. CFGs also represent a popular formalism to specify which words are well-formed and which can be rejected immediately. Assume that we are given a CFG for the legal outputs of a program. This CFG might be derived from the specification as well as from an abstract interpretation of the program. Then the lcp of this language represents a prefix which can be output already, before the program actually has been run. This kind of information is crucial for the construction of *normal forms*, e.g., of string producing processors such as linear tree-to-string transducers [1, 6]. For these devices, the normal forms have further interesting applications as they allow for simple algorithms to decide equivalence [2] and enable efficient learning [7].

Obviously, the lcp of the context-free language L is a prefix of the shortest word in L. Since the shortest word of a context-free language can be effectively computed, the lcp of L is also effectively computable. The shortest word generated from a context-free grammar G, however, may be of length exponential in the size of G. Therefore, it is an intriguing question whether or not the lcp can be efficiently computed.

Here, we show that the longest common prefix can in fact be computed in polynomial time. As the words the algorithm computes with, may be of exponential length, we have to resort to *compressed* representations of long words by means of *straight-line programs* (SLPs) [9]. We will rely on algorithms for basic computational problems for straight-line programs as presented, e.g., in [8].

Our method of computing $\bigsqcap L$, is based on two structural results. First we show in Section 3 that it suffices to consider the finite sublanguage of L consisting of those words, for which there is a derivation tree of height at most $4N$ — with N the number of nonterminals of the CFG for L. This implies that (1) for the proofs we can replace the grammar by an *acyclic* context-free grammar, and (2) the actual fixpoint iteration will converge within at most $4N$ iterations. Second we show in Section 4 that for every non-empty language L there is a subset $L' \subseteq L$ of at most three elements which is *equivalent* to L w.r.t. the lcp after arbitrary concatenations with other words. This means that for every word w, the language $L'w$ has the same lcp as Lw.

We illustrate both results by examples. For the first result, i.e. the restriction to derivation trees of bounded height, consider the language

$$L := \{a^2b(a^2b)^i a^2b(a^2ba)^i a^2ba^2ba^3 \mid i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$$

generated by the context-free grammar consisting of the following rules over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$ and the six nonterminals $\{S, X, A_2, A_1, X_2, X_1\}$:

$$\begin{array}{llll} S \to X_2A_2bA_2bA_2a & A_2 \to aA_1 & A_1 \to a & X \to A_2b \\ & X_2 \to aX_1 & X_1 \to abX & X \to X_2A_2ba \end{array}$$

It is easy to check that here the lcp is already determined by repeating the derivation of X to $aabXaaba$ at most two times which correspondence to the sublanguage consisting

of all words which have a derivation tree of height at most 9.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigsqcap L &= && aabaabaabaabaa\,a && (i=0)\\
&&\sqcap\ && aabaabaabaabaa\,abaabaaa && (i=1)\\
&&\sqcap\ && aabaabaabaabaa\,baaabaaabaabaaa && (i=2)\\
&&\sqcap\ && aabaabaabaabaa\,baabaaabaaabaaabaabaaa && (i=3)\\
&&\sqcap\ && aabaabaabaabaa\,b\ldots && (i\geq 4)\\
&= && aabaabaabaabaa
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that the bound of $4N$, i.e. 24 for this example, on the height resp. the number of iterations needed to converge is a crude overapproximation based on the pigeon-hole principle which does not take into account the structure of the grammar. The actual computation of the lcp may thus terminate much earlier. We discuss this in more detail in Example 3.

We show in Section 4 that for every language L there is a unique longest, possibly infinite, word w_L satisfying $\bigsqcap(Lw) = (\bigsqcap L)w$. Based on this observation, every language can be equivalently represented by a sublanguage consisting of at most three words where these three words have to be chosen such that both the lcp and w_L are preserved. Consider, e.g., the language $L_1 = a(ba)^*$. This language is *quasi-periodic*, meaning that it is a subset of a language uv^* for some words $u, v \in \Sigma^*$. We show that for every quasi-periodic language L we have $w_L = v^\omega$ and L is equivalent to any sublanguage containing both the shortest and any other word of L. Thus, L_1 can be represented by the language $L_1' = \{a, aba\}$.

As a second example, consider the language $L_2 = a + a(bbc^* + bbd^*)$. Here, we have $w_L = bb$. In order to preserve both the lcp and w_{L_2} we may choose $L_2' = \{a, abbc, abbd\}$.

As a last example, consider $L_3 = abab + aba(ba)^*$ with $\bigsqcap L_3 = aba$ and $w_{L_3} = b$. We can choose $L_3' = \{aba, abab, ababa\}$ as an equivalent finite sublanguage; note that $L_3'' = \{aba, abab\}$ is not equivalent to L_3 as it is quasi-periodic with $w_{L_3''} = b^\omega$.

In order to compute the lcp of a given context-free language L we then (implicitly) unfold the given context-free grammar into an acyclic grammar, and compute for every nonterminal of the unfolded grammar an equivalent sublanguage of at most three words, each compressed by means of a SLP, instead of the actual language. From this finite representation of L we then can easily obtain its lcp. Altogether, we arrive at a polynomial time algorithm.

2 Preliminaries

Σ denotes a (finite) alphabet. Σ^* is the set of all finite words over Σ with ε the empty word, Σ^ω the set of all (countably) infinite words over Σ. We use (ω-)rational expressions to denote words and languages, e.g. $w^* = \varepsilon + w + ww + \ldots = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0} w^i$ and $w^\omega = wwwwwwwwww\ldots$.

By $\mathsf{C}_\Sigma = \{(u, v) \in \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*\}$ we denote the set of all pairs of finite words over Σ. We define a multiplication on C_Σ by $(x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y}) := (xy, \bar{y}\bar{x})$. For $(x, \bar{x}) \in \mathsf{C}_\Sigma$ and $w \in \Sigma^*$ set $(x, \bar{x})w = xw\bar{x}$.

For $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ we write $u \sqsubseteq v$ ($u \sqsubset v$) to denote that u is a (strict) prefix of v, i.e. $v = uw$ for some $w \in \Sigma^*$ ($w \in \Sigma^+$). For $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ (with $L \neq \emptyset$) its *longest common prefix* $\mathsf{lcp} \bigsqcap L$ is given by the greatest lower bound of L w.r.t. this ordering. We simply write $u \sqcap v$ for $\bigsqcap\{u, v\}$. Note that for any word $w \in L$ there is at least one word $\alpha \in L$ s.t. $\bigsqcap L = w \sqcap \alpha$; we call any such α a *witness (w.r.t. w)*. Note that $\sqcap$ is commutative and associative; concatenation distributes from the left over the lcp (i.e. $u(v \sqcap w) = uv \sqcap uw$); and the lcp is monotonically decreasing on the union of languages, i.e. $\bigsqcap(L \cup L') = (\bigsqcap L) \sqcap (\bigsqcap L')$. The lcp of infinite words is defined analogously.

A word $p \in \Sigma^*$ is called a power of a word q if $p \in q^*$; then q is called a root of p; if $p \neq \varepsilon$ is its own shortest root, p it is called *primitive*. We recall two well-known results:

Lemma 1 (Commutative Words, [3])**.** *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ be two words. If $uv = vu$, then $u, v \in p^*$ for some primitive $p \in \Sigma^*$.*

Lemma 2 (Periodicity lemma of Fine and Wilf, [5])**.** *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^+$ be two non-empty words. If $|u^\omega \sqcap v^\omega| \geq |u| + |v| - \gcd(|u|, |v|)$, then $uv = vu$.*

Combining these two lemmata yields the following result which is an useful tool in the proofs to follow:

Corollary 1. *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ with $uv \neq vu$.*
Then $u^\omega \sqcap v^\omega = uv \sqcap vu$ with $|uv \sqcap vu| < |u| + |v| - \gcd(|u|, |v|)$.

Proof. Since the bound of the size of $|uv \sqcap vu|$ follows from Lemma 2 we only have to show that $uv \sqcap vu = u^\omega \sqcap v^\omega$. If $|u| = |v|$, then $uv \neq vu$ implies $u \neq v$ and $uv \sqcap vu = u \sqcap v = u^\omega \sqcap v^\omega$.

W.l.o.g. we assume that $|u| < |v|$. As $uv \neq vu$, we have $\varepsilon \neq u$. Let $v \sqcap u^\omega = u^k u' \sqsubset u^{k+1}$ with $v = u^k u' v'$ and $u = u'u''$. It follows that $uv \sqcap vu = uu^k u'v' \sqcap u^k u'v'u = u^k(uu'v' \sqcap u'v'u) = u^k u'(u''u'v' \sqcap v'u'u'')$.

If $v' \neq \varepsilon$, we have $u''u'v' \sqcap v'u'u'' = u'' \sqcap v' = \varepsilon$, and thus $uv \sqcap vu = u^k u' = v \sqcap u^\omega = v^\omega \sqcap u^\omega$.

So assume $v' = \varepsilon$, i.e. $v \sqsubset u^\omega$ with $k > 0$ as $|u| < |v|$. As $uv = u^k u'u''u' \neq u^k u'u'u'' = vu$, also $u'u'' \neq u''u'$. Hence $uv \sqcap vu = u^k u'(u''u' \sqcap u'u'') = u^{k+1}u \sqcap vv = u^\omega \sqcap v^\omega$, which concludes the proof. ☐

Here is a short example for the last corollary:

Example 1. *Let $u = aab$, $v = aaba = ua$. Then $uv \sqcap vu = aabaaba \sqcap aabaaab = aabaa = va$ and $u^\omega \sqcap v^\omega = aabaabaabu^\omega \sqcap aabaaabav^\omega = aabaa$ with $|aabaa| = |u| + |v| - \gcd(|u|, |v|) - 1$. I.e. the bound is sharp. Note that this example also shows, that even if $uv \neq vu$ and $\varepsilon \neq u \sqsubset v$, we still can have $v \sqsubset uv \sqcap vu$.*

We briefly discuss properties of the LCP for very simple regular languages. These will be used several times in the proofs of Section 3 in order to bound the height of the derivation trees we need to consider:

Lemma 3. *Let $y \neq \varepsilon$, then $w \sqcap yw = \bigsqcap y^* w = w \sqcap y^\omega$.*

Proof. Let $w \sqcap y^\omega = y^k y' \sqsubset y^{k+1}$ with $w = y^k y' w'$. Then for any $i > 0$ we have $w \sqcap y^i w = w \sqcap y^{k+i} y' w' = y^k y' = w \sqcap y^{k+1} = w \sqcap y^\omega$ □

Lemma 4. *If $w \not\sqsubseteq yw$, then $\bigsqcap y^* w = w \sqcap yw \sqsubset w$.*

Proof. Since $w \not\sqsubseteq yw$, $w \neq \varepsilon$ and $y \neq \varepsilon$. Assume that $w = w \sqcap yw$, then by the preceding lemma $w = w \sqcap yw = w \sqcap y^\omega$, i.e. $w \sqsubset y^\omega$ and thus $w \sqsubseteq yw$. □

3 LCP of a context-free language

Our main result in this section, Theorem 2 shows that for every context-free language $L = L(G)$ generated by the given CFG G its $\mathsf{lcp}\bigsqcap L$ is equal to the lcp of its *finite* sublanguage L' which contains only those words $w \in L$ which possess a derivation tree w.r.t. G whose height (considering only nonterminals) is at most four times the number of nonterminals of G. For the main result we require the following, very technical lemma.

Theorem 1. *Let $L = (x,\bar{x})[(y_1,\bar{y}_1)+\ldots+(y_l,\bar{y}_l)]^* w$ for $(x,\bar{x}),(y_1,\bar{y}_1),\ldots,(y_l,\bar{y}_l) \in \mathsf{C}_\Sigma$ and $w \in \Sigma^*$.*

Then: $\bigsqcap L = (x,\bar{x})[(y_1,\bar{y}_1)^{\leq 2}+\ldots+(y_k,\bar{y}_l)^{\leq 2}]w$

Further, if $\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^2 w\bar{y}^2\bar{x} \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywy\bar{y}\bar{x}$ for some $(y,\bar{y}) \in \{(y_1,\bar{y}_1),\ldots,(y_l,\bar{y}_l)\}$, then w.r.t. this y there exists some primitive $q \in \Sigma^*$ and some $k > 0$ such that

$$yw = wq^k \wedge q\bar{y} \neq \bar{y}q \wedge \bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywq\bar{y}\bar{x} \wedge xwq^k(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap L \sqsubset xwq^{k+1}(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)$$

The proof of the main theorem of this section, Theorem 2, crucially depends on the observation that in the case $\bigsqcap L \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$, all the words y_i are powers of the same primitive word p with $pw = wq$ and all that is needed to obtain a witness is one additional power of p resp. its conjugate q (with $pw = wq$) to which Theorem 1 refers to. We give an example in order to clarify the statement of Theorem 1 in the case of $l = 2 \wedge y_1 y_2 = y_2 y_1$ which is central to Theorem 2:

Example 2. *We write $(y,\bar{y})$ for $(y_1,\bar{y}_1)$ and $(z,\bar{z})$ for $(y_2,\bar{y}_2)$, respectively. Let $(x,\bar{x}) = (\varepsilon, ababaaa) = (\varepsilon, qqaaa)$, $(y,\bar{y}) = (ab, abaab) = (q, qaab)$, $(z,\bar{z}) = (ab, abaac) = (q, qaab)$, and $w = \varepsilon$ with $q = ab = y = z$. We then have:*

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
xw\bar{x} & = & ababaaa \\
xywy\bar{y}\bar{x} & = & ababaababababaaa \\
xzwz\bar{z}\bar{x} & = & ababaacababaaa \\
xyywy\bar{y}y\bar{y}\bar{x} & = & abababaababaababababaaa \\
xyzwz\bar{y}\bar{z}\bar{x} & = & abababaacabaababababaaa \\
xzywy\bar{z}\bar{y}\bar{x} & = & abababaabaabaacababaaa \\
xzzwz\bar{z}\bar{z}\bar{x} & = & abababaacabaacababaaa \\
x(y+z)^{\geq 3}\ldots & = & abababab\ldots \\
xywq\bar{y}\bar{x} & = & ababababaababaaa \\
xzwq\bar{z}\bar{x} & = & ababababaacababaaa \\
\hline
\bigsqcap L & = & ababa \\
 & = & ababaaa \sqcap ababababaababaaa = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywq\bar{y}\bar{x} \\
 & = & ababaaa \sqcap ababababaacababaaa = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xzwq\bar{z}\bar{x}
\end{array}$$

So in this example, any word except for $xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$ and $xzw\bar{z}\bar{x}$ is a witness for the lcp w.r.t. $xw\bar{x}$. W.r.t. the proof of Theorem 2 it is important that also in general we can pick a witness which either is derived using only $(y, \bar{y})$ or $(z, \bar{z})$ but not both, and that we need to use $(y, \bar{y})$ resp. $(z, \bar{z})$ at most twice in order to get one additional copy of the conjugate q of the primitive root of both y and z.

To give an impression of the proof of Theorem 1 we show the case $l = 1$. The complete proof of Theorem 1 can be found in the appendix.

Lemma 5. *Let $L = (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w$. Then: $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^{\leq 2} w$.*

If $\bigsqcap L \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$, then there is some primitive q and some $k > 0$ s.t.

$$yw = wq^k \wedge q\bar{y} \neq \bar{y}q \wedge \bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywq\bar{y}\bar{x} \wedge xwq^k(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap L \sqsubset xwq^{k+1}(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)$$

Proof. If $y = \varepsilon \vee \bar{y} = \varepsilon$ then by Lemma 4 $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap xw\bar{y}^*\bar{x} = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap \bar{y}x) = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$, respectively $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap xy^* w\bar{x} = x(w\bar{x} \sqcap yw\bar{x}) = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$. Hence, assume that $y \neq \varepsilon$ and $\bar{y} \neq \varepsilon$ in the following.

If $w \not\sqsubseteq yw$, then from Lemma 4 we have $w \sqcap y^* w = w \sqcap yw = w \sqcap y^\omega \sqsubset w$, and thus

$$\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap_{k \geq 0} xy^k w\bar{y}^k\bar{x} = x \bigsqcap y^* w = x(w \sqcap yw) = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}.$$

So assume that $w \sqsubseteq yw$ from now on. Then there is some $\mathfrak{y}$ s.t. $w\mathfrak{y} = yw$. Let q be the primitive root of $\mathfrak{y}$ s.t. $\mathfrak{y} = q^k$ $(k > 0)$. Thus for i large enough that $|w\bar{x}| \leq i\,|y|$, we have

$$\bigsqcap L \sqsubseteq xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^i w\bar{y}^i\bar{x} = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xwq^{ik}\bar{y}^i\bar{x} = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^{ik}) = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega) \sqsubset xwq^\omega.$$

We factorize $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ w.r.t. q^ω:

- Let $\bar{x} = q^n q'\bar{x}'$ with $\bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega = q^n q' \sqsubset q^{n+1}$.
- Let $\bar{y} = q^{k'}\hat{q}\bar{y}'$ with $\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega = q^{k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset q^{k'+1}$.

If $q^n q' \sqsubset q^{k+k'}\hat{q}$, then

$$\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q^{k+k'}\hat{q}\bar{y}'\bar{x}) = xw(q^n q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q^{k+k'}\hat{q}) = xwq^n q' = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega)$$

Thus $q^k(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq q^n q' = \bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega$ for the following.

If $q\bar{y} = \bar{y}q$, then $\bar{y} = q^{k'}$, and $xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$ is a witness as $k > 0$

$$xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^i w\bar{y}^i\bar{x} = xw(q^n q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q^{i(k+k')}q^n q'\bar{x}') = xw(q^n q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q^{n+1}) = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$$

We therefore also assume $q\bar{y} \neq \bar{y}q$ from here on.

If $\bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega = q^n q' = q^{k+k'}\hat{q} = q^k(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)$, then $xyyw\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x}$ is a witness:

$$\begin{aligned} xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyyw\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q^{2k+k'}\hat{q}\bar{y}'\bar{x}) &= xwq^n(q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q) \\ &= xwq^n q' \\ &= xwq^k(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega) \sqsubset xwq^{k+1}(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega) \end{aligned}$$

Note that we only need at most one additional q (coming from $y = q^k$), i.e. also $\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywq\bar{y}\bar{x}$.

It remains the case $q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset q^n q'$, i.e. $q^k\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega \sqsubset \bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega$. Hence $0 < k \leq k + k' \leq n$. Define $\phi \sqsubset q^\omega$ by $\bigsqcap L = xw\phi$. From $q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset q^n q'$ it follows that $xwq^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^i w\bar{y}^i\bar{x}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, implying $\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega = q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq \phi$.

If $\phi = q^{k+k'}\hat{q}$, then we have $\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$: from $xwq^{2k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq xy^i w\bar{y}^i\bar{x}$ for $i > 1$ and $q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset q^n q'$ it follows that $xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^i w\bar{y}^i\bar{x}$ is a strictly longer prefix of xwq^ω than $xwq^{k+k'}\hat{q}$ as $k > 0$.

So assume $q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset \phi$. If $\bar{y}' \neq \varepsilon$, then $xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} = xwq^{k+k'}\hat{q}$ as $q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset q^n q'$. Thus also $\bar{y}' = \varepsilon$ resp. $\bar{y} = q^{k'}\hat{q}$ for the remaining.

As $q\bar{y} = q^{k'}q\hat{q} \neq q^{k'}\hat{q}q$ (recall $q = \hat{q}\hat{\hat{q}}$) also $q\hat{q} \neq \hat{q}q$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} xwq^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq xw\phi \sqsubseteq xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqcap xyyww\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x} &= xwq^{k+k'}(\hat{q}q^n q'\bar{x}' \sqcap q^k\hat{q}\bar{y}\bar{x}) \\ &\overset{n\geq k>0}{=} xwq^{k+k'}(\hat{q}q \sqcap q\hat{q}) \sqsubset xwq^{k+k'}q\hat{q} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $q^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubset \phi \sqsubset q^{k+k'+1}\hat{q}$. That is either $xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$ or $xyyww\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x}$ has to be a witness as we can extend $q^{k+k'}\hat{q}$ by at most $|q| - 1$ symbols, i.e. only by a strict prefix of $\hat{\hat{q}}\hat{q}$; but as $k > 0$, this additional q is again given by $xyyww\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x}$. In particular, we have again that, if $xyyww\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x}$ is a witness, then so is $xywq\bar{y}\bar{x}$, i.e. we only require one additional power of q left of $\bar{y}$ resp. $\hat{q}$. □

Using Theorem 1, we show:

Theorem 2. *Let $L = L(G)$ be given by a contex-free grammar $G = (\Sigma, V, P, S)$ in Chomsky normal form. Let $\hat{L} \subseteq L$ be the finite language of all words of L for which there is a derivation tree w.r.t. G of height[2] at most $4\,|V|$ with V the nonterminals of G. Then: $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap \hat{L}$.*

Proof. Let $L = L(G)$ with G CFG in CNF. Let N be the number of nonterminals of G. Let $\sigma \in L$ be a shortest word, and $\alpha \in L$ a shortest word with $\bigsqcap L = \sigma \sqcap \alpha$. Set $\pi := \bigsqcap L$.

We claim that there is at least one such α (for any fixed σ) that has an derivation tree w.r.t. G of height less than $4N$ (not counting the leaves representing the letters of a word). If $\sigma = \alpha$, we are done as σ has a derivation tree of height less than N. So assume $\sigma \neq \alpha$ s.t. $\sigma = \pi a\sigma'$ and $\alpha = \pi b\alpha'$ with $a \neq b$ alphabet symbols, and fix any derivation tree t of α w.r.t. G.

We will show the stronger claim, namely that any path from the root of t to any letter of πb has length at most $3N$ (i.e. all the paths leading to the separating letter b or a letter left of it, see Figure 1); note that any path that leads to a letter right of b (i.e. into α') has to enter a subtree of height less than N as soon as it leaves the path leading to b because of the minimality of α. Hence, if all the paths leading to b or a letter left of b have length less than $3N$, the longest path in the derivation tree must have length at most $4N$.

[2]We measure the height of a derivation tree only w.r.t. nonterminals along a path from the root to a leaf.



Figure 1: Factorization of a witness $\alpha = (x,\bar{x})(y_1,\bar{y}_1)(y_2,\bar{y}_2)(y_3,\bar{y}_3)w = \pi b\alpha'$ w.r.t. a nonterminal A occurring at least four times a long a path (here the dashed path) in a derivation tree of α leading to a letter either within the LCP $\pi = \bigsqcap L$ or to the letter, here b (the leaf of the dotted path), that bounds the LCP.

So assume there is a path leading to a letter within πb that has at least length $3N$ i.e. consists of at least $3N+1$ nonterminals. Then there is one nonterminal A that occurs at least four times leading to a factorization

$$\alpha = (x,\bar{x})(y_1,\bar{y}_1)(y_2,\bar{y}_2)(y_3,\bar{y}_3)w$$

Note that $x\bar{x} \neq \varepsilon$, $y_i\bar{y}_i \neq \varepsilon$ $(i = 1,2,3)$, and $w \neq \varepsilon$ as G is in CNF. As this path ends at b or left of it, we have $xy_1y_2y_3 \sqsubseteq \pi$ implying that $y_iy_j = y_jy_i$ for all $i,j \in \{1,2,3\}$, so $y_i = p^{k_i}$ for the same primitive p.

Let $L' = (x,\bar{x})[(y_1,\bar{y}_1) + (y_2,\bar{y}_2) + (y_3,\bar{y}_3)]^*w$. By construction $L' \subseteq L$ and thus $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap L' \sqsubseteq xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha$. As $xw\bar{x}$ is shorter than α, it cannot be a witness, so $\pi a \sqsubseteq xw\bar{x}$ and $\pi = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha$. Hence

$$\bigsqcap L = \sigma \sqcap \alpha = \pi = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha = \bigsqcap L'$$

It therefore suffices to consider L' in the following; in particular, α has to be a witness w.r.t. $xw\bar{x}$ of minimal length, too.

By virtue of Theorem 1:

$$\bigsqcap L' = \bigsqcap (x,\bar{x})[(y_1,\bar{y}_1)^{\leq 2} + (y_2,\bar{y}_2)^{\leq 2} + (y_3,\bar{y}_3)^{\leq 2}]w$$

Note that for any $i = 1,2,3$

$$\bigsqcap L' \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy_iw\bar{y}_i\bar{x}$$

as $|xy_iw\bar{y}_i\bar{x}| < |\alpha|$ and thus $xy_iw\bar{y}_i\bar{x}$ cannot be a witness by minimality of α. So for some $I \in \{1,2,3\}$

$$\bigsqcap L' = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy_Iy_Iw\bar{y}_I\bar{y}_I\bar{x} \sqsubseteq \alpha$$

i.e. $xy_Iy_Iw\bar{y}_I\bar{y}_I\bar{x}$ has to be also a witness.

Set $(y, \bar{y}) := (y_I, \bar{y}_I)$ and

$$L'' = (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w$$

so that $L'' \subseteq L' \subseteq L$ and $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap L' = \bigsqcap L''$ as

$$xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyyw\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x} = \bigsqcap L \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap L' \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap L'' \sqsubseteq xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyyw\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqsubset xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$$

Applying Theorem 1 to L'' we obtain that

$$yw = wq^k \wedge q\bar{y} \neq \bar{y}q \wedge \bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap L'' = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywq\bar{y}\bar{x} \wedge xwq^k(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap L \sqsubset xwq^{k+1}(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)$$

for the primitive q satisfying $pw = wq$. As $y_i = p^{k_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, also $y_i w = wq^{k_i}$.

As $xwq^k \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap L \sqsubset xwq^\omega$, we find some $m \geq 0$ and $\dot{q} \sqsubset q$ s.t. $\pi = \bigsqcap L = xwq^k q^m \dot{q}$. As $xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$ is not a witness, but $\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyyw\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x} = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xywq\bar{y}\bar{x}$:

$$\begin{array}{lcllcl}
\pi a & = & xwq^k q^m \dot{q} a & \sqsubseteq & xw\bar{x} & \\
\pi a & = & xwq^k q^m \dot{q} a & \sqsubseteq & xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} & = & xwq^k \bar{y}\bar{x} \\
\pi b & = & xwq^k q^m \dot{q} b & \sqsubseteq & xyyw\bar{y}\bar{y}\bar{x} & \\
\pi b & = & xwq^k q^m \dot{q} b & \sqsubseteq & xywq\bar{y}\bar{x} & = & xwq^{k+1} \bar{y}\bar{x}
\end{array}$$

Hence $\dot{q}b \sqsubseteq q$ as $q^m \dot{q} a \sqsubseteq \bar{y}\bar{x}$ and $q^m \dot{q} b \sqsubseteq q\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqsupseteq qq^m \dot{q} a$. Using $\bigsqcap L \sqsubset xwq^{k+1}(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)$, we further obtain $q^m \dot{q} b \sqsubseteq q(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)$.

If there was at least one $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{I\}$ with $k_j > 0$ s.t. $y_j = p^{k_j} \neq \varepsilon$, then $(x, \bar{x})(y_j, \bar{y}_j)(y, \bar{y})w$ would be a witness shorter than α as:

$$(x, \bar{x})(y_j, \bar{y}_j)(y, \bar{y})w = xy_j yw\bar{y}\bar{y}_j\bar{x} \sqsupseteq xwq^{k+k_j}\bar{y} \overset{k_j > 0}{\sqsupseteq} xywq\bar{y} \overset{q^m \dot{q} b \sqsubseteq q(\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega)}{\sqsupseteq} xwq^k q^m \dot{q} b$$

So for all remaining $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{I\}$ we have $y_j = \varepsilon$ and thus $\bar{y}_j$.

As $\pi a = xwq^{k+m}\dot{q}a \sqsubseteq xy_j w\bar{y}_j\bar{x} = xw\bar{y}_j\bar{x}$, it follows that $q^{k+m}\dot{q}a \sqsubseteq \bar{y}_j\bar{x} = \bar{y}_j q^{k+m}\dot{q}a\bar{x}'$. By Lemma 3 $\bigsqcap xw\bar{y}_j^*\bar{x} = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xw\bar{y}_j\bar{x}$, hence $\pi a \sqsubseteq xw\bar{y}_j^*\bar{x}$, i.e. $q^{k+m}\dot{q}a \sqsubseteq \bar{y}_j^\omega$.

If $q^m \dot{q} b \sqsubseteq \bar{y}_j$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{I\}$ (recall $\dot{q}b \sqsubseteq q$), then as $a \neq b$

$$xw\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})(y_j, \bar{y}_j)w = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^k \bar{y}_j \bar{y}\bar{x}) = xw(q^{k+m}\dot{q}a \sqcap q^{k+m}\dot{q}b) = \pi$$

i.e. $xyy_j w\bar{y}_j\bar{y}\bar{x}$ would be a shorter witness than α. Hence $\bar{y}_j \sqsubseteq q^m \dot{q} \sqsubset q^{k+m}\dot{q}a$ for both $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{I\}$. Thus:

$$\left|q^\omega \sqcap \bar{y}_j^\omega\right| \geq \left|q^{k+m}\dot{q}\right| \geq |q| + |q^m \dot{q}| > |q| + |\bar{y}_j| - \gcd(|q|, |\bar{y}_j|)$$

By the periodicity lemma of Fine and Wilf (Lemma 2) this implies $\bar{y}_j = q^{k'_j}$ for some $k'_j > 0$ (as q primitive), and, subsequently as the final contradiction, that $xy_I y_j w\bar{y}_j\bar{y}_I\bar{x}$ would be a shorter witness. $\square$

4 Small Equivalent Subsets of Languages

In this section we formally introduce a notion of equivalence of languages w.r.t. longest common prefixes. The first main result of this section is that every non-empty language has an equivalent subset consisting of at most three elements. In case of acyclic context-free languages, such a subset can be computed in polynomial time. In combination with Theorem 2, we can lift the restriction on acyclicity. This enables us to ultimately conclude that the longest common prefix of a context-free language can be computed in polynomial time.

Definition 1. *We say that* a language L is equivalent to a language L' w.r.t the lcp *iff*
- $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap L'$, *and*
- *for all words* $w \in \Sigma^*$, $\bigsqcap(Lw) = \bigsqcap(L'w)$.

In this case, we write $L \equiv L'$.

We observe that L is equivalent to L' w.r.t. the lcp also after union or concatenation from the left or right with arbitrary other languages. Formally, this amounts to the following properties:

Lemma 6. *Assume that* L, L' *are non-empty languages and* $L \equiv L'$. *Then for every non-empty language* $\hat{L}$, *the following holds:*

1. $\bigsqcap(L\hat{L}) = \bigsqcap(L'\hat{L})$;
2. $\bigsqcap(\hat{L}L) = \bigsqcap(\hat{L}L')$;
3. $\bigsqcap(L \cup \hat{L}) = \bigsqcap(L' \cup \hat{L})$.

Proof. The argument is as follows:

1. $\bigsqcap(L\hat{L}) = \bigsqcap(\bigsqcap_{w\in\hat{L}}(Lw)) = \bigsqcap(\bigsqcap_{w\in\hat{L}}(L'w)) = \bigsqcap(L'\hat{L})$;
2. $\bigsqcap(\hat{L}L) = \bigsqcap(\hat{L}\bigsqcap L) = \bigsqcap(\hat{L}\bigsqcap L') = \bigsqcap(\hat{L}L')$;
3. $\bigsqcap(L \cup \hat{L}) = \bigsqcap L \sqcap \bigsqcap \hat{L} = \bigsqcap L' \sqcap \bigsqcap \hat{L} = \bigsqcap(L' \cup \hat{L})$.

□

The next lemma gives us an explicit formula for $\bigsqcap(Lw)$ for the special case of the two-element language $L = \{u, uv\}$.

Lemma 7. *Assume that* $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ *with* $v \neq \epsilon$. *For all words* $w \in \Sigma^*$, $\bigsqcap(\{u, uv\}w) = u(w \sqcap v^\omega)$ *holds.*

Proof. $\bigsqcap(\{u, uv\}w) = uw \sqcap uvw$. If w and v are incomparable or w is a prefix of v, $w \sqcap vw = w \sqcap v = w \sqcap v^\omega$, and the claim follows. Thus, it remains to consider the case that $v \sqsubseteq w$. Then $w = v^i w'$ for some i so that v is no longer a prefix of w'. Then $\bigsqcap(\{u, uv\}w) = \bigsqcap(\{u, uv\}v^i w') = uv^i(w' \sqcap vw') = uv^i(w' \sqcap v^\omega) = u(w \sqcap v^\omega)$. □

The explicit formula from Lemma 7 can be used to identify small equivalent sublanguages.

Theorem 3. *For every non-empty language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ there is a language $L' \subseteq L$ consisting of at most three words such that $L \equiv L'$.*

Proof. If L is a singleton language, we choose $L' = L$.

Now assume that L contains at least two words with lcp u. If the lcp u of L is not contained in L then we choose L' as consisting of the two minimal words w_1, w_2 so that $u = w_1 \sqcap w_2$. It remains to consider the case where the lcp u of L is contained in L. Then we have for each word $w \in \Sigma^*$,

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \bigsqcap(Lw) & = & \bigsqcap(\{uv \mid uv \in L\}w) & \\ & = & \bigsqcap\{\bigsqcap(\{u, uv\}w) \mid uv \in L, v \neq \epsilon\} & \\ & = & \bigsqcap\{u(w \sqcap v^\omega) \mid v \in L, v \neq \epsilon\} & \text{(Lemma 7)} \\ & = & u(w \sqcap \bigsqcap\{v^\omega \mid v \in L, v \neq \epsilon\}) & \end{array}$$

If L is quasi-periodic, then all words in L are of the form uv_0^i for some $v_0 \in \Sigma^+$ and $i \geq 0$ where $(v_0^i)^\omega = v_0^\omega$. Thus, $\bigsqcap(Lw) = u(w \sqcap v^\omega)$ for any $uv \in L$ with $v \neq \epsilon$. Hence, $L \equiv L' = \{u, uv\}$ for any such v.

If L is not quasi-periodic, then we choose words $uv_1, uv_2 \in L$ so that the lcp of v_1^ω and v_2^ω has minimal length. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \bigsqcap(\{u, uv_1, uv_2\}w) & = & u(w \sqcap v_1^\omega \sqcap v_2^\omega) \\ & = & u(w \sqcap \bigsqcap\{v^\omega \mid v \in L, v \neq \epsilon\}) \end{array}$$

by the minimality of $v_1 \sqcap v_2$. Therefore, $L \equiv L' = \{u, uw_1, uw_2\}$. □

Since for any non-empty words w_1, w_2 given by SLPs, an SLP for $w_1^\omega \sqcap w_2^\omega$ can be computed in polynomial time, we have:

Corollary 2. *For every non-empty finite $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ consisting of words each of which is represented by an SLP, a subset $L' \subseteq L$ consisting of at most three words can be calculated in polynomial time such that $L \equiv L'$.*

Proof. The proof distinguishes the same cases as in the proof of Theorem 3. If L is a singleton or contains at most three words we are done. Since the words in L are given as SLPs, we can calculate the lcp u of the words in L. Next, we determine whether u is a prefix of every word in L. This can again be checked in polynomial time. If this is not the case, then we can select two words $w_1, w_2 \in L$ so that $u = w_1 \sqcap w_2$ giving us $L' = \{w_1, w_2\}$ in polynomial time. So, now assume that u is a prefix of all words in L. Next, we check whether or not L is quasi-periodic, i.e., whether for any non-empty words v_1, v_2 with $uv_1, uv_2 \in L$, $v_1^\omega = v_2^\omega$. By the periodicity lemma of Fine and Wilf (see also Corollary 1), this is the case iff $v_1v_2 = v_2v_1$. The latter can be checked in polynomial time. If this is the case, then we obtain $L' = \{u, uv\}$ for some $uv \in L$ with $v \neq \epsilon$ in polynomial time.

It remains to consider the case where the lcp u is contained in L and L is not quasi-periodic. Then we need to determine words uv_1 and uv_2 in L with $v_1 \neq \epsilon \neq v_2$ such that $v_1^\omega \sqcap v_2^\omega$ has minimal length. Since (again by the periodicity lemma of Fine and Wilf) $v_1^\omega \sqcap v_2^\omega = v_1v_2 \sqcap v_2v_1$, such a pair can be computed in polynomial time as well. Therefore, $L' = \{u, uv_1, uv_2\}$ can be computed in polynomial time. □

The following lemma explains that equivalence of two non-empty languages of cardinalities at most 3 can be decided in polynomial time.

Lemma 8. *Let $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$ denote non-empty languages consisting of at most three words each, which are all given by SLPs. Then it can be decided in polynomial time whether or not $L_1 \equiv L_2$.*

Proof. If one of the two languages, contains just a single word, then $L_1 \equiv L_2$ iff $L_1 = L_2$ — which can be decided in polynomial time. Otherwise, we first compute the lcps of L_1 and L_2, respectively. If these differ, then L_1 cannot be equivalent to L_2. Therefore assume now that u is both the lcp of L_1 and L_2, respectively.

Now assume that for all words $uv_1 \in L_1, uv_2 \in L_2$ with $v_1 \neq \epsilon \neq v_2$, $v_1^\omega = v_2^\omega$. In this case, both L_1 and L_2 are quasi-periodic with the same period and thus equivalent. Again according to the periodicity lemma of Fine and Wilf, this can be checked in polynomial time.

Next assume that neither L_1 nor L_2 are quasi-periodic, i.e., there are $uv_i, uv_i' \in L_i$, $v_i \neq \epsilon \neq v_i'$, such that $w_i = v_i^\omega \sqcap v_i'^\omega$ is minimal for L_i $(i = 1, 2)$. Then $L_1 \equiv L_2$ iff $w_1 = w_2$. Since w_1, w_2 can be computed in polynomial time, the result follows in this case as well.

Finally, when none of the listed cases applies, L_1 is necessarily inequivalent to L_2. Thus, we ultimately arrive at a polynomial time decision procedure for equivalence. □

Remark 1. *Note that in light of the equivalence test, we can choose distinct letters $a, b \in \Sigma$, and equivalently replace the language $L_1 = \{uv_1, uv_2\}$ with $L_1' = \{ua, ub\}$ whenever $v_1 \neq \epsilon \neq v_2$ and $v_1 \sqcap v_2 = \epsilon$, and the language $L_2 = \{u, uv_1, uv_2\}$ by the language $L_2' = \{u, uwa, uwb\}$ whenever $w = v_1v_2 \sqcap v_2v_1 \neq v_1v_2$ holds. This kind of reduced representation may allow to use shorter words.*

Now we have all pre-requisites to prove the main theorem of our paper.

Theorem 4. *Assume that G is a context-free grammar with $L = L(G)$ non-empty. Then the longest common prefix of L can be calculated in polynomial time.*

Proof. Assume w.l.o.g. that G is a CFG in Chomsky normal form. Then we calculate $\bigsqcap L(G)$ as follows.

We build (implicitly, see the following remark) an acyclic CFG $\hat{G}$ in polynomial time such that $L(\hat{G})$ consists of all words of $L(G)$ for which there is a derivation tree of height at most $4N$ where N is the number of nonterminals in G. To this end, for every rewriting rule $A \to BC$ of G and every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 4N\}$ we add to $\hat{G}$ the rule $A^{(i)} \to B^{(i-1)}C^{(i-1)}$, and for every rule $A \to a$ of G we add the rule $A^{(0)} \to a$ to $\hat{G}$. A straight-forward

induction on i shows that the derivation trees rooted at $A^{(i)}$ are isomorphic to the derivation trees rooted at A of height at most i. For more details, see e.g. [4].

By Theorem 2, we know that $\prod L(G) = \prod L(\hat{G})$. By construction, $\hat{G}$ is also in Chomsky normal form. For i from 0 to (at most) $4N$, we then compute in every iteration for every nonterminal $A^{(i)}$ first the language

$$[A^{(i)}]' := \{a \in \Sigma^* \mid A^{(0)} \to a \in P\} \cup \bigcup_{A \to BC \in G} [B^{(i-1)}] \cdot [C^{(i-1)}]$$

By induction on i, we may assume that the languages $[B^{(i-1)}], [C^{(i-1)}]$ (a) have already been computed, (b) consist of at most three words, and (c) every word is given as an SLP. Note that the cardinality of every language $[A^{(i)}]'$ is polynomial in the size of G. By virtue of Corollary 2, we therefore can reduce $[A^{(i)}]'$ in polynomial time to a language $[A^{(i)}] \subseteq [A^{(i)}]'$ with $[A^{(i)}] \equiv [A^{(i)}]'$ and $\left|[A^{(i)}]\right| \leq 3$. By construction, we then have

$$[A^{(i)}] \quad \equiv \quad \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid A^{(i)} \Rightarrow^* w\}$$

Since $\hat{G}$ has polynomially many nonterminals only, the overall algorithm runs in polynomial time. □

Remark 2. *Note that we can drop the assumption that the grammars G and likewise $\hat{G}$ are in Chomsky normal form if the right-hand sides of all rules have bounded lengths. Then the cardinality of the languages $[A^{(i)}]'$ are still polynomial. Further, instead of spelling out the grammar $\hat{G}$ explicitly, we may perform a round robin fixpoint iteration where in every round we first compute*

$$[A]' := \bigcup_{A \to w_1 B_1 w_2 B_2 \ldots w_k B_k w_{k+1}} \{w_1\} \cdot [B_1] \cdot \{w_2\} \cdot [B_2] \cdots \{w_k\} \cdot [B_k] \cdot \{w_{k+1}\}$$

with initially $[A] := \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid A \to w \in G\}$, then updating $[A]$ so that $[A] \subseteq [A]'$ with $[A] \equiv [A]'$ and $|[A]| \leq 3$. Theorem 2 guarantees that the lcp *is attained after at most $4N$ iterations. Using standard approaches like work lists, we only need to recompute $[A]$ if there is some rule $A \to \gamma B \delta$ in G and $[B]$ has changed since the last recomputation of $[A]$. As shown in Lemma 8 we can easily check if $[B] \not\equiv [B]'$ in every round and accordingly insert A into the work list.*

We demonstrate this simplified version of the algorithm described in Theorem 4 by an example.

Example 3. *Consider the following grammar G with the following rules:*

$$S \to Aababaac$$
$$A \to ab\,A\,abaab \mid ab\,A\,abaac \mid \epsilon$$

The round robin fixpoint iteration would proceed by iteratively evaluating the equations

$$\begin{array}{lcl} [A]' & := & \{abwabaab, abwabaac, \varepsilon \mid w \in [A]\} \\ [S]' & := & \{wababaac \mid w \in [A]\} \end{array}$$

and recomputing the languages $[A]$ *and* $[S]$ *so that* $[A] \equiv [A]'$ *and* $[S] \equiv [S]'$ *and both* $[A]$ *and* $[S]$ *consist of at most three words where we further reduce the words of* $[A]$ *and* $[S]$ *as described in the remark following Lemma 8. As* $[A]$ *does not depend on* $[S]$*, we can postpone the computation of* $[S]$ *after* $[A]$ *has converged. In the first round, we have:*

$$[A] = [A]' = \{\epsilon\}$$

For the second round, we first calculate:

$$[A]' = ab\{\epsilon\}abaab \cup ab\{\epsilon\}abaac \cup \{\epsilon\} = \{ababaab, ababaac, \epsilon\}$$

and thus update $[A]$ *to* $[A] := \{(ab)^2aab, (ab)^2aac, \epsilon\}$*. For the third round, we obtain*

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[A]' & = & ab\{(ab)^2aab, (ab)^2aac, \epsilon\}abaab \cup ab\{(ab)^2aab, (ab)^2aac, \epsilon\}abaac \cup \{\epsilon\} \\
& = & \{(ab)^3a(ab)^2aab, (ab)^3aacabaab, (ab)^2aab\} \cup \\
& & \{(ab)^3a(ab)^2aac, (ab)^3aacabaac, (ab)^2aac\} \cup \{\epsilon\} \\
& \equiv & \{(ab)^3aababaab, (ab)^2aab, \epsilon\} \\
& \equiv & \{(ab)^3, (ab)^2aa, \epsilon\} \\
& =: & [A]
\end{array}$$

which is already the fixpoint. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[S]' & = & \{(ab)^3, (ab)^2aa, \epsilon\}ababaac \\
& = & \{(ab)^3(ab)^2aac, (ab)^2aa(ab)^2aac, (ab)^2aac\} \\
& \equiv & \{(ab)^3(ab)^2aac, (ab)^2aac\} \\
& \equiv & \{(ab)^3, (ab)^2aa\} \\
& =: & [S]
\end{array}$$

So $\bigsqcap L = (ab)^3 \sqcap (ab)^2aa = (ab)^2a$*.*

5 Conclusion

We have shown that the longest common prefix of a non-empty context-free language can be computed in polynomial time. This result was based on two structural results, namely, that it suffices to consider words with derivation trees of bounded height, and second that each non-empty language is equivalent to a sublanguage consisting of at most three elements. For the actual algorithm, we relied on succinct representations of long words by means of SLPs. It remains as an intriguing open question whether the presented method can be generalized to more expressive grammar formalisms.

References

[1] Adrien Boiret. Normal form on linear tree-to-word transducers. In Adrian-Horia Dediu, Jan Janoušek, Carlos Martín-Vide, and Bianca Truthe, editors, *Language and Automata Theory and Applications: 10th International Conference, LATA 2016*, pages 439–451. LNCS 9618, Springer, 2016.

[2] Adrien Boiret and Raphaela Palenta. Deciding equivalence of linear tree-to-word transducers in polynomial time. In Srečko Brlek and Christophe Reutenauer, editors, *Developments in Language Theory: 20th International Conference, DLT 2016*, pages 355–367. LNCS 9840, Springer, 2016.

[3] Christian Choffrut and Juhani Karhumäki. *Combinatorics of Words*, pages 329–438. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.

[4] Javier Esparza, Michael Luttenberger, and Maximilian Schlund. A brief history of strahler numbers. In *Language and Automata Theory and Applications - 8th International Conference, LATA 2014*, pages 1–13. LNCS 8370, Springer, 2014.

[5] N. J. Fine and H. S. Wilf. Uniqueness theorems for periodic functions. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 16(1):109–114, 1965.

[6] Grégoire Laurence, Aurélien Lemay, Joachim Niehren, Sławek Staworko, and Marc Tommasi. Normalization of sequential top-down tree-to-word transducers. In Adrian-Horia Dediu, Shunsuke Inenaga, and Carlos Martín-Vide, editors, *Language and Automata Theory and Applications: 5th International Conference, LATA 2011*, pages 354–365. LNCS 6638, Springer, 2011.

[7] Grégoire Laurence, Aurélien Lemay, Joachim Niehren, Sławek Staworko, and Marc Tommasi. Learning sequential tree-to-word transducers. In Adrian-Horia Dediu, Carlos Martín-Vide, José-Luis Sierra-Rodríguez, and Bianca Truthe, editors, *Language and Automata Theory and Applications: 8th International Conference, LATA 2014*, pages 490–502. LNCS 8370, Springer, 2014.

[8] Markus Lohrey. *The Compressed Word Problem for Groups*. Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, 2014.

[9] Wojciech Plandowski. Testing equivalence of morphisms on context-free languages. In *Algorithms - ESA '94, Second Annual European Symposium*, pages 460–470. LNCS 855, Springer, 1994.

6 Appendix

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We split the proof of the theorem into several lemmata covering the cases

1. $L = (x, \varepsilon)[(y, \varepsilon) + (z, \varepsilon)]^* w = x(y + z)^* w$ (cf. Lemma 9)
2. $L = (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w$ (cf. Lemma 5)
3. $L = (x, \bar{x})[(y, \bar{y}) + (z, \bar{z})]^* w$ (cf. Lemma 10), and
4. $L = (x, \bar{x})[(y_1, \bar{y}_1) + \ldots + (y_l, \bar{y}_l)]^* w$ for arbitrary $l \in \mathbb{N}$. (cf. Lemma 11).

Lemma 9. $L = x(y+z)^*w \Rightarrow \bigsqcap L = x\bigsqcap(y+z)^{\leq 1}w$

Proof. As x does not matter, simply assume $x = \varepsilon$. We show by induction on m that for any $\alpha \in (y+z)^m w$

$$w \sqcap yw \sqcap zw = w \sqcap yw \sqcap zw \sqcap \alpha$$

The case $m \leq 1$ is obviously true. Fix any $m > 1$ and any $\alpha \in (y+z)^{m+1}w$; wlog. $\alpha = \alpha' yw$. Set $w' = w \sqcap yw$. Then:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} w \sqcap yw \sqcap zw \overset{\text{Induction}}{=} w \sqcap yw \sqcap zw \sqcap \alpha' w & = & w' \sqcap zw \sqcap \alpha' w' \\ & = & w' \sqcap zw \sqcap \alpha'(w \sqcap yw) \\ & = & w \sqcap yw \sqcap zx \sqcap \alpha' w \sqcap \alpha' yw \end{array}$$

□

Lemma 10. *Let* $L = (x,\bar{x})[(y,\bar{y}) + (z,\bar{z})]^* w$. *Then* $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap (x,\bar{x})[(y,\bar{y})^{\leq 2} + (z,\bar{z})^{\leq 2}]w$.

Proof. The case $y = \varepsilon = z$, i.e. $L = xw(\bar{y}+\bar{z})^*\bar{x}$ is already proven in Lemma 9.

Consider the case $yz \neq zy$. Let α be a witness (w.r.t. $xw\bar{x}$). Assume α is of the following form for some suitable $j \geq 0$

$$\alpha = xy^j yz\alpha' \bar{z}\bar{y}\bar{y}^j\bar{x}$$

(The case $\alpha = xz^j zy\alpha'\bar{y}\bar{z}\bar{z}^j\bar{x}$ is symmetrical.) Then (swapping the inner most y and z still yields a word of L):

$$\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^j yz\alpha' \bar{z}\bar{y}\bar{y}^j\bar{x} \sqcap xy^j zy\alpha'\bar{y}\bar{z}\bar{y}^j\bar{x} = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^j(yz \sqcap zy)$$

Using Corollary 1:

$$xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^j(yz \sqcap zy) = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xy^j(y^\omega \sqcap z^\omega)$$

But obviously

$$xyzw\bar{z}\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqcap xzyw\bar{y}\bar{z}\bar{x} = x(yz \sqcap zy) \sqsubseteq xy^j(yz \sqcap zy)$$

So either $xyzw\bar{z}\bar{y}\bar{x}$ or $xzyw\bar{y}\bar{z}\bar{x}$ has to be a witness, too.

But again by virtue of Corollary 1 and for sufficiently large j

$$xyzw\bar{z}\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqcap xzyw\bar{y}\bar{z}\bar{x} = xy^\omega \sqcap xz^\omega = (x,\bar{x})(y,\bar{y})^j w \sqcap (x,\bar{x})(z,\bar{z})^j w$$

Hence, we already find a witness within $(x,\bar{x})[(y,\bar{y})^* + (z,\bar{z})^*]w$ and, thus, within $(x,\bar{x})[(y,\bar{y})^{\leq 2} + (z,\bar{z})^{\leq 2}]w$

So assume for the following that $yz = zy$ with $y = p^k \wedge z = p^l$ and p primitive (wlog. $k \geq l$). Wlog. $\max\{k,l\} > 0$. (If $k = 0$, then $y = \varepsilon = z$ which we have already discussed.)

Let $w = p^m p' w'$ with $p = p'p''$ and $w \sqcap p^\omega = w \sqcap p^{m+1} = p^m p' \sqsubset p^{m+1}$. Set $q = p''p'$ s.t. $pp' = p'q$ and $q \sqcap w' = \varepsilon$ and $p'' \neq \varepsilon$. As p is primitive, so is q.

If $w \not\sqsubset p^\omega$, then $w' \neq \varepsilon$. If $y \neq \varepsilon$, then $xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$ is a witness; if $z \neq \varepsilon$, then $xzw\bar{z}\bar{x}$ is a witness, too.

Hence, $w \sqsubset p^\omega$ in the following. Then $w' = \varepsilon$ and $pw = wq$. We factorize $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ w.r.t. q:

- Let $\bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega = q^n q' \sqsubset q^{n+1}$ with $\bar{x} = q^n q' \bar{x}'$ and $q = q'q''$ and $q'' \neq \varepsilon$.
- Let $\bar{y} \sqcap q^\omega = q^{k'} \hat{q} \sqsubset q^{k'+1}$ with $\bar{y} = q^{k'} \hat{q} \bar{y}'$ and $q = \hat{q}\hat{\hat{q}}$ and $\hat{\hat{q}} \neq \varepsilon$.
- Let $\bar{z} \sqcap q^\omega = q^{l'} \dot{q} \sqsubset q^{l'+1}$ with $\bar{z} = q^{l'} \dot{q} \bar{z}'$ and $q = \dot{q}\ddot{q}$ and $\ddot{q} \neq \varepsilon$.

Thus:

$$L = (xw, q^n q' \bar{x}')[(q^k, q^{k'} \hat{q} \bar{y}') + (q^l, q^{l'} \dot{q} \bar{z}')]^* \varepsilon$$

Wlog. $y = p^k \neq \varepsilon$, i.e. $k > 0$, and further $k \geq l$.

Let α be a witness w.r.t. $xw\bar{x}$. We may distinguish the following cases for a witness α (with $\Gamma = (y, \bar{y}) + (z, \bar{z})$):

(1) $\alpha \in (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w$

(2) $\alpha \in (x, \bar{x})(z, \bar{z})^* w$

(3) $\alpha \in (x, \bar{x}) \Gamma^* (z, \bar{z})(y, \bar{y})^+ w$

(4) $\alpha \in (x, \bar{x}) \Gamma^* (y, \bar{y})(z, \bar{z})^+ w$

(The case $\alpha = xw\bar{x}$ is covered by both (1) and (2).)

Cases (1) and (2) are both covered by Lemma 5. Hence, we may assume in the following that any witness is of the form (3) or (4) – otherwise we are done.

As $k > 0$, we have

$$\bigsqcap L \sqsubseteq xw\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^{n+1} w = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^{k(n+1)}) = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^{n+1}) = xwq^n q'$$

Hence $\bigsqcap L = xw\phi$ for some suitable $\phi \sqsubseteq q^n q'$; if $\phi = q^n q'$, then $(x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^{n+1} w$ would be a witness, contradicting our assumption that any witness of the form (3) or (4).

Hence, $\phi \sqsubset q^n q'$, i.e. $\bigsqcap L = xw\phi \sqsubset xwq^n q' = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^\omega)$; so, any witness α has to satisfy

$$xw\phi = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha = xwq^n q' \sqcap \alpha = xwq^\omega \sqcap \alpha$$

as α has to differ from $xw\bar{x}$ within the suffix $q^n q'$.

If $n < k$, then

$$xw\bar{x} \sqcap \underbrace{x \ldots y \ldots w \ldots \bar{y} \ldots \bar{x}}_{\in (x,\bar{x})\Gamma^*(y,\bar{y})\Gamma^* w} = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^k) = xw(\bar{x} \sqcap q^{n+1}) = xwq^n q'$$

So, either $xyw\bar{y}\bar{x}$ is a witness, or y cannot occur in any witness, implying that either $xzw\bar{z}\bar{x}$ or $xzzw\bar{z}\bar{z}\bar{x}$ is a witness.

Hence, $n \geq k \geq l$ with $n > 0$ as $k > 0$.

We need to take a closer look at the structure of a respective α. As case (4) is a special case of (3), we discuss (3) in detail and only remark where the proof differs from case (4).

So assume $\alpha \in (x, \bar{x}) \Gamma^* (z, \bar{z})(y, \bar{y})^+ w$. Then

$$\alpha = xwq^{\lambda l + \mu k} q^l q^{jk} q^k q^{k'} \hat{q} \bar{y}' (q^{k'} \hat{q} \bar{y}')^j q^{l'} \dot{q} \bar{z}' \beta q^n q' \bar{x}'$$

where λ (μ) is the number of z (y) right of x and left of the inner most z; and β is the corresponding string of $\bar{y}, \bar{z}$, e.g. if $\lambda + \mu = 0$, then $\beta = \varepsilon$.

As $\alpha \sqcap xw\bar{x} = xw\phi \sqsubset xwq^n q'$, we have

$$q^k q^{k'} \hat{q} \sqsubseteq q^l q^k q^{k'} \hat{q} \sqsubseteq q^{\lambda l + \mu k} q^l q^{jk} q^k q^{k'} \hat{q} \sqsubseteq \phi \sqsubset q^n q'$$

If $\bar{y}' \neq \varepsilon$, then

$$xw\phi = \alpha \sqcap xwq^\omega = xwq^{\lambda l + \mu k} q^l q^{jk} q^k q^{k'} \hat{q} \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q' \sqcap q^k q^{k'} \hat{q}) = xwq^k q^{k'} \hat{q}$$

So $\bar{y}' = \varepsilon$ in the following.

We first do away with the case $\hat{q} = \varepsilon$:

If $\hat{q} = \varepsilon$ (i.e. $\bar{y} = q^{k'}$), then

$$\alpha = xwq^{\lambda l + \mu k} q^l q^{jk} q^k q^{k'} (q^{k'})^j q^{l'} \dot{q} \bar{z}' \beta q^n q' \bar{x}'$$

Hence:

$$q^l q^{l'} \dot{q} \sqsubseteq q^l q^{l'} \dot{q} \sqsubseteq q^{\lambda l + \mu k} q^l q^{jk} q^k q^{k'} (q^{k'})^j q^{l'} \dot{q} \sqsubseteq \phi \sqsubset q^n q'$$

Note: As $k > 0$, we trivially have $qq^l q^{l'} \dot{q} \sqsubseteq q^{\lambda l + \mu k} q^l q^{jk} q^k q^{k'} (q^{k'})^j q^{l'} \dot{q}$ in contrast to case (4); but we always may assume in the case $\hat{q}\bar{y}' = \varepsilon$ that $k + k' > 0$ as otherwise $(y, \bar{y}) = \varepsilon$ which also holds analogously in case (4).

Obviously $\dot{q}\bar{z}' \neq \varepsilon$, as otherwise $xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha = xwq^n q'$.

If $\bar{z}' \neq \varepsilon$, we obtain the contradiction $xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xzw\bar{z}\bar{x} = xwq^l q^{l'} \dot{q}$ as $q^{l+l'} \dot{q} \sqsubset q^n q'$; so $\dot{q} \neq \varepsilon = \bar{z}'$ (i.e. $\bar{z} = q^{l'} \dot{q}$), and $\beta \in (q^* \dot{q})^*$.

As q primitive and $\varepsilon \neq \dot{q} \sqsubset q$, we have $\dot{q}q \neq q\dot{q}$ and thus $\dot{q}^\omega \sqcap q^\omega = \dot{q}q \sqcap q\dot{q} \sqsubset q\dot{q}$.

Hence (using $n > 0$ and $qq^{l+l'} \dot{q} \sqsubset q^n q'$):

$$xw\phi \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xzw\bar{z}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q' \sqcap q^{l+l'} \dot{q}q) = xwq^{l+l'} (q\dot{q} \sqcap \dot{q}q) \sqsubset xwq^{l+l'} q\dot{q} \sqsubseteq xw\phi$$

Thus also $\hat{q} \neq \varepsilon$ from here on.

Again, as q primitive and $\varepsilon \neq \hat{q} \sqsubset q$, we have $\hat{q}q \neq q\hat{q}$ and thus $\hat{q}^\omega \sqcap q^\omega = \hat{q}q \sqcap q\hat{q} \sqsubset q\hat{q}$.

Hence (using $n > 0$)

$$xw\phi \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q' \sqcap q^{k+k'} \hat{q}q) \sqsubset xwqq^{k+k'} \hat{q}$$

If $\lambda l + \mu k + l + jk > 0$, we obtain the contradiction

$$qq^{k+k'} \hat{q} \sqsubseteq \phi \sqsubset qq^{k+k'} \hat{q}$$

analogously to the case $\hat{q}\bar{y}' = \varepsilon$.

Note: In case (4) we are done at this point, as $k > 0$ takes the place of $l \geq 0$ in case (4).

So $\lambda l + \mu k + l + jk = 0$, i.e. $l = j = \mu = 0$ as $k > 0$ for the following allowing us to write

$$\alpha = xwq^k q^{k'} \hat{q} q^{l'} \dot{q} \bar{z}' (q^{l'} \dot{q} \bar{z}')^\lambda q^n q' \bar{x}'$$

If $l' > 0$, then (using $n > 0$ and $\hat{q} \sqsubset q$)

$$xw\phi = \alpha \sqcap xwq^\omega \sqsubset xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqcap xwq^\omega = xw(q^{k+k'}\hat{q}q \sqcap q^\omega) = \alpha \sqcap xwq^\omega$$

So we have to have $l' = 0$ which allows us to further simplify α:

$$\alpha = xwq^k q^{k'} \hat{q}\dot{q}\bar{z}'(\dot{q}\bar{z}')^\lambda q^n q'\bar{x}'$$

If $\bar{z}' \neq \varepsilon$, then (using $n > 0$ and $\dot{q} \sqsubset q$)

$$xw\phi \sqsubset xw\bar{x} \sqcap xzw\bar{z}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q' \sqcap xw\dot{q}\bar{z}'q^n q') = xw\dot{q} \sqsubset xwq \sqsubseteq xwq^k q^{k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq xw\phi$$

So $\bar{z}' = \varepsilon$ and thus $\dot{q} \neq \varepsilon$ (else $z = \varepsilon$ and $\bar{z} = \varepsilon$):

$$\alpha = xwq^k q^{k'} \hat{q}\dot{q}(\dot{q})^\lambda q^n q'\bar{x}'$$

Again we then have $\dot{q}q \neq q\dot{q}$, i.e. $q^\omega \sqcap \dot{q}^\omega = q\dot{q} \sqcap \dot{q}q \sqsubset q\dot{q}$.

Hence (using $n > 0$ and $\dot{q} \sqsubset q$): $xw\bar{x} \sqcap xzw\bar{z}\bar{x} = xw(q^n q' \sqcap \dot{q}q^n q') \sqsubset xwq\dot{q}$.

We therefore have

$$xwq^{k+k'}\hat{q} \sqsubseteq \alpha \sqcap xwq^\omega = xw\phi \sqsubset xwq\dot{q}$$

i.e. $k' = 0$, $k = 1$, and $\hat{q} \sqsubset \dot{q}$ s.t.:

$$\alpha = xwq\hat{q}\dot{q}(\dot{q})^\lambda q^n q'\bar{x}'$$

As $n > 0$, $\hat{q} \sqsubset \dot{q} \sqsubset q$, $\phi \sqsubset q\dot{q}$, we obtain the final contradiction:

$$xw\phi = \alpha \sqcap xwq^\omega \overset{|\phi|<|q\dot{q}|\leq|q\hat{q}\dot{q}|}{=} xw(q\hat{q}\dot{q} \sqcap q^\omega) \overset{\dot{q}\sqsubset q,|\phi|<|q\dot{q}|}{=} xw(q\hat{q}q \sqcap q^\omega) = xyw\bar{y}\bar{x} \sqcap xwq^\omega$$

□

Lemma 11. *Let* $L = (x, \bar{x})[\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i, \bar{y}_i)]^* w$. *Then* $\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap (x, \bar{x})[\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i, \bar{y}_i)^{\leq 2}]w$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in L$ be a witness i.e. $\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha$.

Then

$$\alpha = (x, \bar{x}) \prod_{j=1}^{k} (y_{i_j}, \bar{y}_{i_j})w$$

for suitable $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

If $k = 1$, we are done. Assume $k \geq 2$ for any witness (and any such factorization). Pick a witness α and a factorization that minimizes k. Set

$$(y, \bar{y}) = (y_{i_1}, \bar{y}_{i_1}) \qquad (z, \bar{z}) = (y_{i_2}, \bar{y}_{i_2}) \qquad w' = \prod_{j=3}^{k} (y_{i_j}, \bar{y}_{i_j})w$$

Then using Lemma 10

$$\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \alpha = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \bigsqcap \underbrace{(x, \bar{x})[(y, \bar{y}) + (z, \bar{z})]^* w'}_{\subseteq L \ni \alpha} = xw\bar{x} \sqcap \bigsqcap (x, \bar{x})[(y, \bar{y})^{\leq 2} + (z, \bar{z})^{\leq 2}]w'$$

So, one of the words on the right-hand side has to be a witness too. If $k = 2$, we have $w' = w$, and we are also done. Hence assume $k \geq 3$ from now on. Because of our assumption that α is a witness with a minimal factorization, only $(x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^2 w'$ or $(x, \bar{x})(z, \bar{z})^2 w'$ can be a witness. Because of symmetry, it suffices to assume $\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^2 w'$. As $k \geq 3$ we have $w' = (y_{i_3}, \bar{y}_{i_3}) \prod_{j=4}^{k} (y_{i_j}, \bar{y}_{i_j}) w$. Set $(z', \bar{z}') = (y_{i_3}, \bar{y}_{i_3})$ and $w'' = \prod_{j=4}^{k} (y_{i_j}, \bar{y}_{i_j}) w$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigsqcap L &= xw\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^2 w' \\ &= xw\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^2 (z', \bar{z}') w'' \\ &= xw\bar{x} \sqcap \bigsqcap \underbrace{(x, \bar{x})[(y, \bar{y})^2 + (z', \bar{z}')]^* w''}_{\subseteq L} \end{aligned}$$

Using again Lemma 10 this is equivalent to

$$\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xw''\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^2 w'' \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(z', \bar{z}') w'' \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^4 w'' \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(z', \bar{z}')^2 w''$$

As $(x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w' \subseteq L$, adding $\bigsqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w''$ cannot change the lcp

$$\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xw''\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(z', \bar{z}') w'' \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(z', \bar{z}')^2 w'' \sqcap \bigsqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^* w''$$

Using Lemma 5 we finally obtain

$$\bigsqcap L = xw\bar{x} \sqcap xw''\bar{x} \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(z', \bar{z}') w'' \sqcap (x, \bar{x})(z', \bar{z}')^2 w'' \sqcap \bigsqcap (x, \bar{x})(y, \bar{y})^{\leq 2} w''$$

Again, we have to find another witness within the words occurring on the right-hand side. But all these words have a factorization using less factors than α contradicting our choice of α. Hence, there has to be a witness having a factorization with $k \leq 2$. Thus:

$$\bigsqcap L = \bigsqcap_{i=1}^{n} (x, \bar{x})(y_i, \bar{y}_i)^{\leq 2} w$$

□